

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Proposition 1E Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Grant Program *Stormwater Flood Management Grant, Round 2, 2013*

Applicant	Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency	Amount Requested	\$ 1,909,910
------------------	--------------------------------------	-------------------------	--------------

Proposal Title	Florin Creek Multi-Use Basin	Total Proposal Cost	\$ 3,819,820
-----------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------	--------------

PROJECT SUMMARY

The project is located on Florin Creek in the City of Sacramento. The primary goal of the project is to provide flood protection to structures within the City of Sacramento and County of Sacramento by reducing flood risk and by facilitating the completion of the South Sacramento Streams Group (SSSG) project. Florin Creek is a tributary to Morrison Creek that traverses the City of Sacramento and unincorporated Sacramento County. The project consists of an approximately 35 acre-foot detention basin. Working in conjunction with the USACE's Florin Creek channel improvements, a weir will be constructed at the right bank of Florin Creek at Florin Creek Park to allow floodwaters to spill into the park in storm events exceeding an approximate 25-year storm. Lower flows of more frequent events will be allowed to enter a portion of the basin to provide water quality and environmental benefits. Other benefits claimed include groundwater management, ecosystem restoration, and recreation and public access.

PROPOSAL SCORE

Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible	Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible
Work Plan	9/15	Technical Justification	6/10
Budget	3/5		
Schedule	4/5	Benefits and Cost Analysis	21/30
Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures	2/5	Program Preferences	7/10
Total Score (max. possible = 80)			52

EVALUATION SUMMARY

WORK PLAN

The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. The work plan does not provide sufficient detail to fully support the feasibility of the proposed project. For example, the detention basin design and construction tasks lack detail on detention dimensions that are referenced in the project list and proposed work discussions. Construction details related to “installation of landscaping and site amenities, and planting of environmental features” on page 16 are not explained. What are these amenities and features. The work plan includes a listing of permits and CEQA documentation needed, but does not provide a status of permitting conditions. Also, for the claimed benefits of groundwater management, ecosystem restoration, and recreation and public access, there is insufficient detail in the Work Plan deliverables to determine if these goals would be realized.

BUDGET

The budget includes detailed cost information as described in Attachment 4 but not all costs appear reasonable, and supporting documentation is lacking for a majority of items shown in the Budget categories described in Exhibit B. A summary Budget and corresponding individual budgets are provided for the Project; however, the individual Budgets for (1) Planning/Design/Engineering/ Environmental Documentation tasks; (2) Environmental Compliance/Mitigation/Enhancement tasks; (3) Construction Administration tasks; and (4) Construction/Implementation Contingency items are all shown as lump sums, and are lacking a breakdown of anticipated hours and estimated unit costs. The costs shown for each task seem reasonable, but explanations are brief, a descriptive narrative is lacking, and documentation is insufficient for determining how these lump sums are estimated. The tasks in the budget are consistent with the work plan and schedule.

SCHEDULE

The tasks in the schedule are consistent with the tasks described in the work plan and the budget; however, with a conceptual design of 10 %, there is no supporting explanation in the Schedule to determine the certainty of the construction timeline. The CEQA permitting task is estimated to last 55 days; given that there is a 45-day comment period involved this is too short a period for the CEQA process to be completed.

MONITORING, ASSESSMENT, AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES

The criterion is marginally addressed and documentation is incomplete and insufficient. The table is lacking metrics for quantifying or measuring project performance. The measurement tools and methods presented in the Table may not effectively monitor project performance and target progress. For example, no flow measurement or flood protection metrics are given to determine if the flood control benefit is achieved. No water quality metrics such as physical quantities or targets are given to determine if that benefit is achieved. For the enhancing habitat goal, no performance indicators such as actual quantities of acreage converted into wetland and habitat area or number of native plants planted in the area are given.

TECHNICAL JUSTIFICATION

The proposal appears to be technically justified to achieve the claimed benefits but lacks documentation that demonstrates the technical adequacy of the project and physical benefits are not well described. The physical benefits are identified and described within the proposal and the flood benefits are supported by documentation; however, the water supply and water quality benefits are not clearly supported by technical analysis or supporting

documentation. For example, the applicant proposes that there will be a water quality benefit, but the proposal lacks a characterization of constituents currently in the creek and what the goal is after Project completion. The proposal is lacking a discussion on the prospective volume of detained water, and does not quantify the water supply benefit.

BENEFITS AND COST ANALYSIS

Collectively the proposal is likely to provide a medium level of benefits in relationship to cost, and this finding is supported by detailed, high quality analysis and clear and complete documentation. The total project cost is \$4.1 million in present value (PV). The proposal used the procedure outlined by the USACE Economic Guidance Memorandum to calculate flood damage reduction (FDR) benefits for 6 flood events. Structure sizes and values were estimated from current sales or appraised value data for the neighborhood. Annual benefit (reduction of estimated annual damage with versus without project) was just under \$200,000. This results in FDR benefits of \$2.93 million in PV. Additional non-monetized benefits are described, including recreation, wildlife habitat, water quality, and groundwater recharge.

PROGRAM PREFERENCES

Applicant demonstrates with high certainty that the proposal will implement 3 program preferences and 4 statewide priorities, and documents the magnitude and breadth of each that the proposal will achieve. The proposal will achieve the following: 1) Include regional projects or programs; 2) Effectively integrate water management programs and projects within hydrologic region; 3) Effectively resolve significant water-related conflicts within or between regions; 4) Climate Change Response Actions; 5) Expand Environmental Stewardship; 6) Practice Integrated Flood Management; and 7) Ensure Equitable Distribution of Benefits.